

IN THE REMARKS

Please amend the remarks as follows:

The Office rejected the oath as being defective because the S-signature for each inventor did not appear between forward slashes. Accordingly, the inventors have properly executed a new oath in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.67(a) identifying the application number and filing date as required.

The Office urged the Applicants to submit any co-pending applications that could be considered material to the examination of the instant invention. Applicants have reviewed the co-pending applications, and do not regard any of them to be material to the instant application. Specifically, Applicants regard none of the co-pending applications as being drawn to, or disclosing the arrangement of the tool joint and tube which allow passage of a transmission line between the tool joint and the tube in the manner described and claimed in the present application.

The Office objected to a number of informalities in the specification. Accordingly, paragraphs 36, 39, 40, 41, and 42 have been amended as suggested by the Office. No new matter has been added.

Additionally Paragraph [0001] has also been amended now to correct the Department of Energy Contract Number. No new matter has been added.

The Office also objected to the drawings because it was unclear as to whether Figures 2 and 4 were prior art. Accordingly, Paragraphs [0014] and [0016] have been amended now to reflect that figure 2 and figure 4 respectively, are drawn to the present invention. The fact they are drawn to the present invention is readily apparent from the specification, as particularly described in paragraphs [0033] through [0036] where numerous elements of the claimed inventions are described and referenced with drawing numerals shown in figures 2 and 4. Additionally, most of

the reference numerals in both figures 2 and 4 are also shown in the other drawing figures which are described as being of the present invention.

The Office objected to claims 1-15 because of informalities. ~~Accordingly, the informalities have been corrected as suggested by the Office. No new matter has been added. The claims 1-15 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot.~~

The Office rejected claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Denison et al (US 4,095,865). ~~Claim 1 has been amended to include that the tool joint is also adapted for connection to an adjacent tool. Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-16 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot.~~

~~Denison et al (US 4,095,865) does not teach or disclose a tool joint being attached to the upset on the tube at the first and second interfacial surfaces, the tool joint also being adapted for connection to an adjacent tool, and that an opening formed within the wall of the tool joint is in alignment with a passageway formed in the upset. In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is no longer anticipated by Denison et al (US 4,095,865).~~

~~Since claims 2, 4-6 and 8-15 all depend from now allowable claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 4-6 and 8-15 are also now allowable.~~

~~Claim 16 has also been amended to include that the tool joint is adapted for connection to an adjacent tool when the tool joint and the tube are joined together and that an opening formed within the wall of the tool joint is in alignment with a passageway formed in the upset, which is not taught or disclosed by Denison et al (US 4,095,865). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is also now allowable.~~

The Office rejected claim 1-2 and 4-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608). ~~Claims 1-2 and 4-16 have been cancelled rendering this rejection moot. The applicants respectfully transverse this rejection. Papadopoulos does not~~

~~teach nor disclose a upset formed on the end of the tube having an effective diameter less than the inside diameter of the tube. With respect to Fig. 1, Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608) shows a downhole component having a tube with an upset end at both the pin end and the box end. However, the box end comprises an inside diameter greater than the inside diameter of the tube and the pin end comprises an inside diameter which appears to be substantially equal to the inside diameter of the tube.~~

~~Applicants also respectfully submit that Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608) does not teach or disclose a tool joint being attached to the upset on the tube at the first and second interfacial surfaces, that the tool joint is also adapted for connection to an adjacent tool and that an opening formed within the wall of the tool joint is in alignment with a passageway formed in the upset, which is included in now amended claim 1. Applicants feel that in either case amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608) and is therefore allowable. Since claims 2 and 4-15 depend from allowable base claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 and 4-15 are also allowable. As described above, Claim 16 has also been amended to include that the tool joint is adapted for connection to an adjacent tool when the tool joint and the tube are joined together, which is not taught or disclosed by Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is now allowable.~~

The Office rejected claim 3 as being unpatentable over Denison et al (US 4,095,865). Claim 3 has been cancelled rendering this rejection moot. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome Denison et al (US 4,095,865) and since claim 3 depends from claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is now allowable over Denison et al (US 4,095,865).

The Office rejected claim 3 as being unpatentable over Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608). Claim 3 has been cancelled rendering this rejection moot. Applicants respectfully submit that amended base claim 1 is allowable over Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608) and since claim 3 depends from amended base claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is allowable over Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608).

New claims 17-32 have been added. Claims 17-31 address the informalities that the examiner objected to in canceled claims 1-15, which were modified as the examiner suggested. No new matter has been added.

New claims 17-18, 20-22, and 24-32 address the rejection of canceled claims 1-2, 4-6 and 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Denison et al (US 4,095,865). Claim 17 includes that the tool joint is also adapted for connection to an adjacent tool.

Denison et al (US 4,095,865) does not teach or disclose a tool joint being attached to the upset on the tube at the first and second interfacial surfaces, the tool joint also being adapted for connection to an adjacent tool, and that an opening formed within the wall of the tool joint is in alignment with a passageway formed in the upset. In view of this argument, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is allowable over Denison et al (US 4,095,865).

Since claims 18, 20-22 and 24-31 depend from claim 17, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18, 20-22 and 24-31 are also allowable.

Claim 32 also includes that the tool joint is adapted for connection to an adjacent tool when the tool joint and the tube are joined together and that an opening formed within the wall of the tool joint is in alignment with a passageway formed in the upset, which is not taught or disclosed by Denison et al (US 4,095,865). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is now allowable.

New claims 17-18 and 20-32 are responsive to the rejection of now canceled claims 1-2 and 4-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608). The Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection. Papadopoulos does not teach nor disclose an upset formed on the end of the tube having an effective diameter less than the inside diameter of the tube. With respect to Fig. 1, Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608) shows a downhole component having a tube with an upset end at both the pin end and the box end. However, the box end comprises an inside diameter greater than the inside diameter of the tube and the pin end comprises an inside diameter which appears to be substantially equal to the inside diameter of the tube.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608) does not teach or disclose a tool joint being attached to the upset on the tube at the first and second interfacial surfaces, that the tool joint is also adapted for connection to an adjacent tool and that an opening formed within the wall of the tool joint is in alignment with a passageway formed in the upset, which is included in claim 17. Applicants feel that in either case that claim 17 is not anticipated by Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608) and is allowable. Since claims 18 and 20-31 depend from allowable base claim 17, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18 and 20-31 are also allowable. Claim 32 includes that the tool joint is adapted for connection to an adjacent tool when the tool joint and the tube are joined together, which is not taught or disclosed by Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is allowable.

New claim 19 addresses the rejection of canceled claim 3 as being unpatentable over Denison et al (US 4,095,865). The Applicants respectfully submit that since claim 19 depends from allowable base claim 17, that claim 19 is also allowable over Denison et al (US 4,095,865).

New claim 19 also addresses the rejection of canceled claim 3 as being unpatentable over Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608). The Applicants respectfully submit that since claim 19 depends from allowable base claim 17 that claim 19 is also allowable over Papadopoulos (US 3,518,608).

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 4-16 17-32 of the application are now allowable, putting the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 180584 an amount totaling \$250, comprising \$120 for the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(a)(1) for a one month extension for time and \$130, the surcharge fee required under 37 CFR 1.16(f) for a late filed declaration. It is believed that there are no other fees due at this time. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required at any time during the prosecution of this application without specific authorization, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 180584. If there are any questions concerning the above, please contact the undersigned at (281) 878-5658.

Respectfully submitted,




Jeffery E. Daly
Reg. No. 44,640

Grant Prideco, L.P.
400 N. Sam Houston Parkway East
Suite 900
Houston, TX 77060
Ph: 281-878-5658
Fax: 281-878-5720
e-mail: jeffery.daly@grantprideco.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria VA 22313-1450 or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

1/30/06
Date

Signature 

Please charge Deposit Account No. 180584 an amount totaling \$250, comprising \$120 for the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(a)(1) for a one month extension for time and \$130, the surcharge fee required under 37 CFR 1.16(f) for a late filed declaration. It is believed that there are no other fees due at this time. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required at any time during the prosecution of this application without specific authorization, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 180584. If there are any questions concerning the above, please contact the undersigned at (281) 878-5658.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffery E. Daly
Reg. No. 44,640

Grant Pridaco, L.P.
400 N. Sam Houston Parkway East
Suite 900
Houston, TX 77060
Ph: 281-878-5658
Fax: 281-878-5720
e-mail: jeffery.daly@grantpridaco.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria VA 22313-1450 or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

1/30/06
Date

Signature 